REMARKS

In the Advisory Action mailed on **21 August 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-32. Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mooney et al. (USPN 7,127,209 hereinafter "Mooney").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Mooney. Examiner specifically points out that these claims do not provide any specifics or details of installation.

Applicant respectfully points out that Mooney describes techniques for **detecting modem-based services, generating a service record for the identified modem-based services, and communicating the service record to the needy communication devices** (see Mooney, abstract and col. 6, lines 35-51).

In contrast, the instant application teaches enabling a client device to use a new service by **installing a service profile** associated with a new service on the client device, **wherein the service profile includes a specification that describes how to use the new service**. More specifically, the instant application further teaches that **installing the service profile involves causing code to be generated to implement the specification and causing the code to be installed on the client** (see paragraph [0039], lines 4-8 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it not only allows clients to obtain implementations of standard profiles that they do not initially configured to use, but also allows clients to **obtain *arbitrary* device-specific protocol stacks** (see paragraph [0041], lines 1-3 of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully submits that the process involving the service record in Mooney is distinctively different from the process involving the service profile of the instant application. Specifically, the service record in Mooney is used as a checklist that can be stored in a storage medium, but **does not involve**

10

generating a code to implement a specification describing how to use the service record and/or installing the code. In contrast, the service profile in the instant application **is installed on the client by generating a code to implement the specification describing how to use the service profile, and subsequently installing the code**.

Hence, there is nothing within Mooney, either explicitly or implicitly, which suggests installing the service profile by generating a code to implement a specification describing how to use the service profile.

Applicant further respectfully points out that that the installation process of the instant application is distinctively different from a typical device driver installation process. Specifically, during a typical device driver installation, the device drive is an executable code and the installation involves directly executing the device driver. In contrast, during the service profile installation, the present invention involves **generating a code to implement a specification describing how to use the service record**. **This code generation step is clearly not involved during the typical device driver installation**.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that instant application installs the service profile for a new service by **generating a code to implement the specification describing how to use the service profile, and subsequently installing the code**. These amendments find support on paragraph [0039], lines 4-8 and paragraph [0041], lines 1-3 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Applicant has cancelled dependent claims 4, 14, and 24 without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-13 and 15-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-23 and 25-30, which depend upon claim 21, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in

11

condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   ___/Shun Yao/_____
             Shun Yao
             Registration No. 59,242

Date: 27 August 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com